

REMARKS

The claims stand rejected for the same reasons presented in the final Office Action. Applicant maintains the following arguments.

Referring to Figs. 4A and 4B of Mabuchi, the detection circuit 12 receives any signal g and demodulates it. However, the circuit is not able to distinguish reshaped signals from non-reshaped signals. Hence, there will be no difference in the output of the detection circuit for a reshaped signal or a non-reshaped signal. That is, the form of signal h in Fig. 4B will be the same either way. This is also explained in the instant specification, on page 2, first full paragraph, where it stats that “using conventional, inductively acting receivers, to distinguish whether the field strength has been reduce or the reshaping described above has been switched on, and because the reshaping cannot be reproduced by conventional transmitters, either.”

In the claimed invention, on the other hand, the detector 16, 40 is able to distinguish reshaped signals from non-reshaped signals (see, for example, claim 1 requiring that “the reshaping can be detected by a detector in the receiver”). More specifically, this is accomplished by using sensor 40 which converts a magnetic flag’s density or a magnetic field strength to an electrical voltage or current, e.g. a sensor in the form of a hall sensor (see, for example, page 5 of the instant specification). Consequently, since reshaping can be detected by the detector, it is possible for a receiver or detector to detect whether a signal is coming from a predetermined transmitter (see, for example, page 4, lines 1-4). A signal which has been subjected to reshaping and transmitted by the transmitter can consequently be reliably identified in the receiver, unlike in the applied prior art.

The claims have been amended to include that the method/device can distinguish between reshaped and non-reshaped signals, and that this enable the method/device to determine that the signal is coming from the transmitter. As such, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 449122004000.

Dated: February 8, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Kevin R. Spivak

Registration No.: 43,148

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300

McLean, Virginia 22102

(703) 760-7762